

### **REMARKS**

Claims 32, 35, 40, and 43-46 were pending. Applicants have canceled claims 32 and 43-46 without prejudice to applicant's right to pursue their subject matter in a continuation application.

Applicants request entry of this amendment such that claims 35 and 40 will be pending.

#### **35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph, Written Description Requirement**

Claims 32, and 43-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim allegedly contain subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In response, without conceding this ground of rejection, applicants have canceled claims 32 and 43-46. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

#### **35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph, Enablement**

Claims 32 and 43-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification allegedly fails to comply with the enablement requirement.

Since claims 32 and 43-46 are no longer pending, this ground of rejection is moot. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

#### **35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, Clarity**

Claims 32, 35, 40, and 43-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In particular, the Examiner objects to the phrase "is based upon the structure of the binding pocket of" in claims 32 and 44-46.

In response, Applicants note that claims 32 and 44-46 have been canceled. Claims 35 and 40, the only remaining claims, do not recite the phrase in question. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

**Obviousness-type Double Patenting**

Claims 32, 35, 40, and 43-46 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being allegedly unpatentable over claims 3 and 4 of U.S. Patent 5,874,531.

In response, without conceding the correctness of this ground of rejection, applicants are submitting a suitable terminal disclaimer with this amendment. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

**35 U.S.C. 102(a)**

Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being allegedly anticipated by WO 94/020127.

Since claim 46 is no longer pending, this ground of rejection is moot. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

**35 U.S.C. 102(e)**

Claims 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,329,499.

Since claims 44-46 are no longer pending, this ground of rejection is moot. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

**35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claims 44 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Registry Accession No. 160218-02-0 (18 January 1992) in view of De Bruijin et al.

Since claims 44 and 46 are no longer pending, this ground of rejection is moot. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection.


**CONCLUSIONS**

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response in addition to those indicated on the fee-transmittal documents. However, if an additional fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-1945, under Order No. HUIP-P02-001 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: January 23, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Ignacio Perez de la Cruz

Registration No.: 55,535

FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP, ROPES & GRAY  
LLP

One International Place  
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-2624  
(617) 951-7289  
(617) 951-7050 (Fax)  
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant